

Town of Exeter  
Zoning Board of Adjustment  
July 21, 2020, 7 PM  
Exeter Town Hall  
Final Minutes

I. **Preliminaries**

**Members Present:** Clerk Rick Thielbar, Laura Davies, Kevin Baum, Christopher Merrill - Alternate, Esther Olson-Murphy - Alternate, Ann Surman - Alternate

**Members Absent:** Chair Joanne Petito, Vice-Chair Robert Prior, Martha Pennell - Alternate, Hank Ouimet - Alternate

**Others Present:** Doug Eastman, Barbara McEvoy

**Call to Order:** Acting Chair Rick Thielbar called the meeting to order at 7 PM. Of the alternates present, Mr. Merrill and Ms. Olson-Murphy will be voting tonight.

II. **New Business**

- A. The application of Benjamin and Sarah Anderson for a modification to a previously granted variance from Article 4, Section 4.2 which permitted the use of the existing accessory barn on their property for community gatherings. The Applicant is seeking relief to permit the operation of a nano-brewery and tasting room, with limited hours, in the basement/ground floor of the barn structure. The subject property is located at 66 Newfields Road, in the RU-Rural zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #24-29. Case #20-2. [Deferred]

Mr. Baum moved to approve the applicant's request for a continuance of case #20-2. Ms. Davies seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

- B. The application of One Home Builders LLC II for an Equitable Waiver of Dimensional Requirements per RSA 674:33-a to permit each of the three (3) existing buildings on the property at 69 Main Street to remain as constructed which exceed the maximum height requirement in the C-1, Central Area Commercial zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #63-255. Case #20-6.

Christian Smith of Beals Associates discussed this case, which relates to buildings that have already been constructed. They're requesting that each of the three buildings stay at 38 - 39 feet in height, rather than the 35 feet required by zoning. He discussed the four criteria for their request. a) The height violation was not noticed by the owner, owners' agents, or Exeter Planning and Building department until all buildings were substantially complete. b) The violation was not the outcome of

43 ignorance of the ordinance or bad faith by the owner or any of the owners'  
44 representatives. Building height as defined by the 2015 International Building code is  
45 from the eave to the ridge when measuring building height, which is not how the Exeter  
46 code defines it. This was a simple good faith error by the architectural professionals.  
47 Additionally, the standard building framing studs were replaced by trusses, which are  
48 larger structural members that added to the roof height of the buildings. c) The violation  
49 does not result in a public or private nuisance, nor diminish the value of abutting  
50 property, and does not adversely affect any current or future use on the parcel. d) The  
51 cost of correcting this minor height violation outweighs any possible public benefit  
52 gained by requiring correction of the roof heights to bring them into compliance.

53 Ms. Davies asked Mr. Smith to explain the "eave to ridge measurement." Doug  
54 Eastman, the Building Inspector, said that Town Zoning Ordinance regulations only  
55 allow 35 feet maximum building height, while the building code refers to the average  
56 of the ridge and the eave height. The applicant also increased the thickness of the  
57 materials to make it more solid, which added height. Mr. Thielbar asked if any member  
58 of the public had complained. Mr. Eastman said one abutter wrote a letter requesting  
59 a 12 foot fence, which they would not allow, but the building owners have put up an 8  
60 foot fence. Mr. Baum asked if the building plans stated a height of 35 feet, and Mr.  
61 Smith said yes, but they weren't aware of an issue until the buildings were complete.

62 Mr. Thielbar asked for public comment, but there was none. He closed the  
63 discussion to the public.

64 Mr. Baum said they're talking about tearing down and redesigning the three  
65 buildings for a few feet, which seems disproportionate. He thought the relief was  
66 appropriate. Ms. Davies agreed. Ms. Olson-Murphy agreed, but said she found it hard  
67 to believe no one on the site caught this issue earlier.

68 Ms. Davies moved to approve the equitable waiver of dimensional requirements for  
69 this application at 69 Main Street. Mr. Merrill seconded. The motion passed  
70 unanimously.

71  
72 C. The application of Carol Miller for an Appeal from an Administrative Decision  
73 made by the Historic District Commission at their November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2019 meeting  
74 regarding a request for replacement windows. The subject property is located  
75 at 30 High Street, in the R-2, Single Family Residential zoning district. Tax Map  
76 Parcel #71-6. Case #19-20.

77  
78 Anthony Bearisto said the company he works for, Window World, is looking to  
79 put new vinyl windows in at 30 High Street. They already have a previous approval for  
80 40 High Street, but the Historic District Commission denied them for this property. Mr.  
81 Thielbar said the minutes of the HDC meeting make it clear that the applicant did not  
82 find out what the requirements are, nor did the application give a clear definition of the

83 scope of work, such as how many windows are involved. He finds that the material  
84 submitted to the ZBA has the same issues. The application that was rejected was  
85 inadequate.

86 Mr. Baum said they should treat this as a rehearing from scratch, not be deciding  
87 whether the HDC was reasonable. The applicant has the same burden to show that  
88 they meet the Historic District Ordinance requirements, and must show how their plan  
89 meets the standard. Mr. Bearisto said that at 30 High Street, some windows have  
90 already been replaced. There are only 10 windows left to finish the house. Mr. Baum  
91 asked if when those windows were replaced, it was with the approval of the HDC, and  
92 Mr. Bearisto said he didn't know.

93 Carol Miller, the owner of 30 High Street, said she thought that she was just  
94 putting in replacement windows, and that as long as there were no dimensional  
95 changes it didn't require approval. The other windows were replaced four or five years  
96 ago. Mr. Bearisto added that the windows to be replaced are mostly on the side and  
97 back, although there could be two on the front. Ms. Olson-Murphy said that the HDC  
98 minutes say there are 13 windows to be replaced, but Mr. Bearisto said that his records  
99 say 10. Ms. Surman asked if Ms. Miller was given the HDC guidelines. Ms. Olson-  
100 Murphy said the HDC minutes note that they were sent to her.

101 Mr. Thielbar opened the discussion to the public.

102 Patrick Gordon, the HDC Chair, said that the Historic District Commission  
103 guidelines are clarified in Article 8 of the Zoning Ordinance. The ZBA must make a de  
104 novo judgement based on Article 8 and the HDC's recommendations. The vinyl  
105 windows were replaced at this property in the past without an application to the HDC.  
106 Doug Eastman told the applicant that if the windows were replaced in kind as far as  
107 material, proportion, and look, an application would not be needed, but they were not  
108 replaced in kind, and so they were in violation of HDC guidelines. Those windows are  
109 now being used as precedent to replace the remaining windows. The proposed  
110 windows violate several sections of Article 8.8.2c, specific design considerations: #2,  
111 the proportions of the openings in the facade; #7, the relationship with adjacent  
112 structures, which do not have vinyl windows; and #9, the relationship of color of  
113 prefinished or natural materials, as vinyl fades more quickly than other materials. They  
114 tabled the application to allow the applicant to review the zoning ordinance, but the  
115 applicant did not. The guidelines spell out the preferred material options, such as  
116 composite, fiberglass, or particulate fiberglass and resins, which have better color  
117 retention and structural properties. The vinyl windows are historically not appropriate.

118 Mr. Baum said in the past, an applicant has submitted some information on how  
119 they meet the historical guidelines of Article 8, but there has been no such submission  
120 by the applicant in this case. These windows don't meet #2, 7, and 9 as discussed by  
121 the HDC, as well as #10, relationship of architectural details. The other windows were  
122 replaced not in conformance with the ordinance, so their replacement should not be

123 used in the consideration of the appeal.

124 Mr. Thielbar said due to missing information in the minutes of the HDC meeting,  
125 he doesn't have a clear idea of why the HDC rejected the application. The applicant  
126 installed aluminum storm windows over the historic windows, so replacing them with  
127 vinyl windows would be an improvement.

128 Ms. Surman asked if they deny the appeal, if the applicant can go back to the  
129 HDC with information about how they're meeting the historical guidelines? Mr. Baum  
130 said yes, if the applicant submitted a different application attempting to address  
131 concerns, the HDC would consider it.

132 Mr. Baum moved to deny the application for appeal from administrative decision by the  
133 Historic District Commission at the November 21 2019 meeting regarding a request for  
134 replacement windows. Ms. Olson-Murphy seconded. The motion passed unanimously

135  
136 D. The application of Blake Properties of NH, LLC for a variance from Article 4,  
137 Section 4.2 Schedule I to permit the proposed construction of a 12-unit multi-  
138 family building on the property located at 57 Portsmouth Avenue; a special  
139 exception per Article 4, Section 4.4 Schedule III (Note #12) to permit the height  
140 of the proposed building to exceed 35 feet; and variances from Article 4, Section  
141 4.3 Schedule III seeking relief from the minimum yard setbacks, maximum  
142 building coverage, dwelling unit density and maximum height requirements for  
143 the proposed construction. The subject property is located in the C-2, Highway  
144 Commercial zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #65-137. Case #20-5.

145  
146 John Ratigan of Donahue, Tucker and Ciandella, representing applicant Gary  
147 Blake, was present to discuss the application, as well as Jonathan Ring of Jones and  
148 Beech Engineering and Michael Keane, the architect.

149 Mr. Ring said the property is located on Portsmouth Avenue. The lot is 11,770  
150 square feet. They are proposing one building with an area of 5650 square feet,  
151 containing 12 one bedroom condominium units. There would be 12 parking spaces on  
152 the first level, 6 units on the second floor, and 6 units on third floor, with 3 additional  
153 parking spaces outside. The plan meets the Planning Board criteria for parking spaces.  
154 They will have stormwater detention before the water drops into a town catchbasin. He  
155 added that six years ago, a coffee shop approached the owner about being located at  
156 this property, and a special exception was granted at that time.

157 Mr. Keane, the architect, said the site rises 14 feet from Portsmouth Avenue to  
158 the back property line. By putting the parking on the first level, they can use the parking  
159 wall as a retaining wall and maintain the slope. The first level disappears into the  
160 ground in the back. The roofs are pitched, which requires a height variance; if they had  
161 a flat roof, they would meet the 35 foot height requirement. The peaks break up the  
162 roof line and resemble more traditional roof forms. The proposed height is 44 feet

163 maximum, from the Portsmouth elevation to the peak of the roof. They don't intend the  
164 area behind the building to be used by the residents.

165 Mr. Ratigan described the requested variances, to permit a multifamily dwelling  
166 in the C2 zoning district and to allow narrower setbacks. In the C2 zone, the setback  
167 requirements are 30 feet in the rear yard and 20 feet on the sides, while the applicants  
168 are requesting 4 feet on one side, 7 feet on the other side, and a rear setback of 14.3  
169 feet. This application is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Master Plan,  
170 which calls for housing that supports walkability and healthy living as well small  
171 housing. Given the hotel around the corner, this development is consistent with the  
172 character of the neighborhood. People at the hospital are very interested in small  
173 housing near their employment, especially in the Covid situation. Multi use is allowed  
174 in this zoning district, and they think this project fits into the spirit of the ordinance.  
175 Nothing about this project is adverse to public health, safety, and welfare. There is no  
176 public benefit to denying this application that outweighs the substantial benefits the  
177 proposed development will provide to the community. Real Estate Agent Florence  
178 Ruffner has submitted a letter stating that the development would not diminish the  
179 value of surrounding properties. Regarding hardship, the special condition of this  
180 property is its size. Any development of this property for uses permitted in this zone  
181 will require some kind of zoning relief.

182 They've also submitted an application for a special exception from the height  
183 criteria; the Board could either grant the height variance or the special exception.

184 Mr. Baum asked about the height difference of the project with the buildings on  
185 either side. Mr. Ring said Hampton Inn and Suites is about 60 feet tall. The driveway  
186 on the other side is very steep, so the house is up relatively high, perhaps 10 or 15 feet  
187 above. It's at least at the second level of the building, perhaps 35 feet above  
188 Portsmouth Avenue.

189 Ms. Davies asked where the 12 unit density came from, as it seems aggressive  
190 for this lot. Mr. Keane said that one of the allowed uses here is a hotel, so one  
191 alternative they considered was extended stay hotel rooms for the Hampton Inn, but  
192 transient occupancy doesn't seem as desirable for the neighbors as longer-term  
193 residents. That plan informed the design put forward with their application.

194 Mr. Thielbar asked if there will be a problem with Fire Department access, given  
195 the building's fit on the property. Mr. Ring said they do have yard access to the back  
196 of the building, and they are not required to have a fire lane around the entire property.  
197 The FD could get around the entire property on foot. There will be fire suppression  
198 such as sprinklers inside. The fire code allows 12,000 square feet per floor for a  
199 sprinkled building, while the proposed building is only 5,000 square feet per floor. Ms.  
200 Davies asked if he was saying they could get a bigger building on this site, but Mr. Ring  
201 said no, the 12,000 feet would be for a larger lot, but he was discussing code  
202 compliance in general.

203 Mr. Thielbar said they're being too aggressive with the building size on this lot.  
204 Lot coverage is 48% instead of 30%. Mr. Ratigan said that the parking is determining  
205 the size. Ms. Davies said it's the decision to go for 12 units that is driving the size of  
206 the parking. Mr. Thielbar said there should be ways to design it that would put less  
207 building on the property.

208 Kim Montgomery, an abutter of the property, said it's a huge building but with  
209 apartments that are very small, which will attract single people and lots of visitors. It  
210 will not be good for the neighborhood, which is congested, and will make more traffic.  
211 Making a smaller building with larger units would make for larger setbacks.

212 Rachel Trabelsi of 12 Highland Street asked why she didn't receive an abutter's  
213 letter for this project. Mr. Baum said she is on the abutter's list and the notice was sent  
214 certified mail, so she would have had to sign for it. Ms. Trabelsi said when the property  
215 was regraded, it was put out of alignment with the abutting properties. She has a  
216 working horse barn on her property, and a small business composting manure. There  
217 will be smells and issues with the three apartments on the back. There was sex  
218 trafficking in the neighborhood and in the hotel, and a building for single people will  
219 encourage more of this activity. She would prefer to see something commercial in this  
220 space. They also have issues with parking and accidents in their neighborhood  
221 already. She asked why the zoning restrictions are a hardship for this property. It will  
222 be a hardship on her if the building is constructed this way.

223 Kim Montgomery said she reviewed the plans and didn't see where the garbage  
224 or HVAC system are. She has Seacoast Mental Health as an abutter and their systems  
225 vibrate her wall. This will be a large system as well.

226 Mr. Keane said HVAC equipment would be on the roof, likely 12 ductless split  
227 units on the center section of the roof. These residential HVAC units are fairly quiet.  
228 Trash would likely be in the lot in small bins, although they haven't designed a trash  
229 area yet. "Multifamily" is a term used in the code, it doesn't refer to how many people  
230 are living in each unit, just that there are multiple units. By design, they're most suited  
231 to single occupants, but it's not the applicant's intent to restrict it. Ms. Davies asked if  
232 they would consider that kind of restriction, given the parking situation. Mr. Keane said  
233 yes, potentially, and the lease will also stipulate there is only one space per unit. Ms.  
234 Davies asked if this will be a condominium form of ownership, but Mr. Keane said he  
235 doesn't think there's been a determination of that; he thinks it would likely be rental  
236 apartments. He said regarding the number of variances, the developable portion of this  
237 lot is only 50 feet long and 10 feet wide without setback relief, so there is virtually  
238 nothing that could be constructed without relief. Mr. Thielbar asked if the site has gotten  
239 smaller since they purchased it; Mr. Keane said no, but the zoning has become more  
240 restrictive. The abutters' concerns can be addressed by a fence, so if the Board  
241 imposes a fence as a condition of approval that would be fine. Ms. Davies asked if the  
242 HVAC units would be proximate to the abutters' buildings. Mr. Keane said the units will

243 be screened by other areas of the roof.

244 Mr. Baum said the special exception granted in 2014 has expired, so they're  
245 looking fresh at an exception from a 50 foot setback.

246 Mr. Thielbar closed the discussion to the public.

247 Ms. Davies said she doesn't have an issue with the use, but this is a massive  
248 building for this site. She didn't hear why it's necessary to have 12 units. Ms. Olson-  
249 Murphy said there will have to be variances no matter what, but these variances are  
250 extreme. Mr. Baum said there are special conditions here and some relief is warranted,  
251 but this is asking too much for the site.

252 Mr. Ratigan said they can come back with a redesign, but they would like an  
253 approval of the use case for multifamily use. Mr. Merrill asked if that locks them into  
254 doing a multifamily use. Ms. Davies said if they don't use the exception, it will expire.  
255 Mr. Baum said the distinction is whether the Board is ok with parking vs commercial on  
256 the first floor. He's fearful of granting just that variance without knowing how it would  
257 be applied. Mr. Thielbar said they should consider the proposal as a whole. Ms. Davies  
258 agreed.

259 Mr. Ratigan stated that the applicant would like to withdraw the application.

260  
261 E. The application of Gerry Hamel for a special exception per Article 4, Section 4.2  
262 Schedule I: Permitted Uses and Article 5, Section 5.2 to permit the proposed  
263 construction of a second residential unit on the property located at 7 Hampton  
264 Road. The subject property is located in the NP-Neighborhood Professional  
265 zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #69-32. Case #20-7.

266  
267 Mr. Hamel would like to build a house at 7 Hampton Road, in an NP area. This  
268 is a large, oversize lot with one house that they're renovating on it already. The second  
269 house would be the same size, 30x24 feet, a two story building with three bedrooms.  
270 There are more than ample setbacks. There are other multiunit properties in the  
271 neighborhood.

272 Ms. Davies asked if the new building and the existing building would be  
273 attached. Mr. Hamel said yes, he wanted to attach the corners.

274 Mr. Baum said no relief is needed for the density or setbacks. Two family is  
275 permitted, but with a special exception.

276 Ms. Davies went through the special exception criteria. A) That the use is a  
277 permitted special exception as set forth in Article 4.2 Schedule I; yes, it's in the NP  
278 district, so residential uses or conversions are permitted. B) That the public health,  
279 safety, welfare, and convenience are not adversely affected; she can't see an issue  
280 with any of those factors in this application. C) That the proposed use will be compatible  
281 with the zoned district and adjoining post-1972 development; yes, she doesn't think it's  
282 incompatible with any uses in the area. Mr. Thielbar said there are a lot of houses there

283 already. D) Adequate landscaping and screening are provided; Mr. Hamel said there  
284 is existing screening on the site that would be maintained. E) Adequate offstreet  
285 parking and loading is provided and ingress and egress is so designed as to cause  
286 minimal interference with traffic on abutting streets; Mr. Hamel said the existing  
287 driveway configuration will remain, and there will be no new curb cut. F) The use  
288 conforms with all applicable regulations governing the district where located; Ms.  
289 Davies said doesn't see any issues relevant to this criteria. G) May be required to  
290 obtain Town Planning review; she doesn't think that's necessary for a two unit building.  
291 H) Shall not adversely affect abutting or nearby property values; as the applicant  
292 stated, there's already multiunit development in the area. I) Bulk storage of Materials;  
293 not applicable. J) Tech Park district; not applicable.

294 Mr. Thielbar asked if any member of the public would like to speak about the  
295 proposed development, but there was no comment. Mr. Thielbar closed the session to  
296 the public.

297 Mr. Merrill asked how Mr. Hamel will do both this project and the other project  
298 for which they applied for an extension. Mr. Hamel said they are in process with the  
299 latter renovation first, then they will build the new house. He will be doing more GC  
300 work than physical work on the new house.

301 Ms. Davies moved to approve the application for special exception Article 4 section 4.2  
302 schedule 1 for the proposed construction of a second residential unit on the property located  
303 at 7 Hampton Road, as proposed in the application. Ms. Olson-Murphy seconded. The motion  
304 passed unanimously.

305  
306  
307  
308 F. The application of William P. Bragger, LLC for a variance from Article 4, Section  
309 4.3, Schedule II and Article 5, Section 5.1.2(A) to permit the proposed  
310 construction of an additional dwelling above the existing 4-bay garage structure  
311 on the property at 111 Court Street. The subject property is located in the R-2,  
312 Single Family Residential zoning district. Tax Map Parcel #83-52. Case #20-9.

313  
314 Justin Pasay of DTC Lawyers spoke on behalf of the applicant, William Bragger,  
315 who was also present by phone. Jonathan Ring of Jones and Beech Engineering was  
316 also present for this application. Mr. Pasay said that in 2006, this property came before  
317 the ZBA; at the time, it was a five unit property, and they came for a special exception  
318 to expand a non-conforming use and attained approval. This time they are seeking a  
319 variance from two articles, Article 4, Section 4.3, Schedule II regarding density  
320 provisions, and 5.1.2(A), which prohibits the expansion of a non-conforming use  
321 without a variance. These are to facilitate an 11th and final two-bedroom unit on the  
322 property. The density in the R2 zone for multifamily is 12,000 square feet of lot area

323 per unit, where the amount they have is 7,097 per unit. The plan has sufficient parking:  
324 16 spaces are required and 18 are provided. The unit would be built onto an existing  
325 four bay garage, with no change in the building's footprint. This is in the R2 zone, and  
326 several developments in this area have a similar density. The goal is for the owner to  
327 move into the new unit.

328 Mr. Bragger, the owner, said that he is in failing health and is planning to move  
329 into the unit to be closer to his daughter, who lives in another unit on the property.

330 Jonathan Ring from Jones and Beech Engineering said he was involved in the  
331 2006 project to take the property from 5 units to 10 units. In this project, they are adding  
332 onto an existing garage, so there is no additional impervious surface area. It's 1.63  
333 acres and it's on water and sewer, but there are no changes to drainage or setbacks.

334 Mr. Baum asked about the height difference between what is present now and  
335 what is proposed. Mr. Ring said about 12 additional feet, but it's still less than the limit  
336 of 35 feet for this zone.

337 Mr. Thielbar and Ms. Davies were concerned about the footprint changing, as  
338 there didn't appear to be room for egress from the unit. Mr. Bragger said they're  
339 planning an unenclosed outside staircase to the second floor. It would be on the  
340 existing pavement. Mr. Ring said even if they lose a parking space, they have two more  
341 than required. Mr. Eastman said if the staircase is the only egress, it must be enclosed.  
342 Mr. Bragger said he accepts that stipulation. Mr. Baum said it sounds like the footprint  
343 will be slightly larger; if they need dimensional relief, they would have to come back for  
344 another variance. Mr. Pasay said he doesn't believe that they will need dimensional  
345 relief, but he will defer to the Building Inspector.

346 Mr. Pasay went through the variance criteria. 1) Whether the variance is  
347 contrary to public interest; no, the density regulations are about preserving the  
348 aesthetic appeal and function of property and protecting public safety, all of which are  
349 done by this proposal. This will beautify the property, and if it's even discernable from  
350 the street it will improve the view. 2) Will the variance alter the essential character of  
351 the neighborhood; no. This is proven by the tax maps submitted with the application  
352 which show the various multifamily properties nearby, some of which have greater  
353 density than what they're proposing. He also cited the Master Plan, which talks about  
354 the importance of diverse housing stock. 3) Substantial justice is done by granting the  
355 variance; there is a huge benefit to the owner, and it also supports the Master Plan,  
356 while causing no harm to the public. There's no public benefit to denying the variance.  
357 4) Diminishment of property values; there's no evidence to support that. This  
358 development may even have a positive effect on surrounding property values. 5) Literal  
359 enforcement of the ordinance would result in unnecessary hardship; the special  
360 conditions here are the relatively large size of this property versus surrounding  
361 properties. It's also located next to town property, the skatepark, which makes it seem  
362 larger.

363 Mr. Thielbar asked for public comment, but there was none. He closed the public  
364 session.

365 Mr. Baum said they're talking about one additional dwelling unit on a large parcel  
366 that already has multiple dwelling units, in a large area that is adjacent to the skatepark  
367 and conservation land, as well as a commercial property. He doesn't think the addition  
368 of another dwelling unit will have an impact on the essential character of the  
369 neighborhood or threaten public health, safety, or welfare. Regarding substantial  
370 justice, the impact to the public doesn't outweigh the benefit to the applicant. The tax  
371 maps showed that the density is fairly consistent with other properties in the area. It  
372 won't diminish surrounding property values, it's a beautiful building, and this will  
373 improve the garage which is the least aesthetic part of the property. The hardship is in  
374 the uniqueness of the parcel and the area. The use is permitted and reasonable.  
375

376 Mr. Baum moved to approve the application of William P. Bragger LLC for a variance from  
377 Article 4 Section 4.3 Schedule 2 and Article 5 Section 5.1.2a to permit the construction of an  
378 additional dwelling unit above the existing four bay garage structure at the property, subject  
379 to the condition that there be no additional units added to the property. Ms. Davies seconded.  
380 The motion passed unanimously.

381  
382  
383  
384 **III. Other Business**

385 A. Benham Investment – Case #17-13 - 28 Newfields Road Request for extension  
386 of variance approval (expires 3/21/20)

387 Mr. Thielbar considered Mr. Hamel's request for extension first. March 22nd,  
388 ask for extension to variance for two houses at 28 Newfields Road. Mr. Hamel  
389 said he's been trying to sell his house, at which point he can tackle this project.  
390 He applied prior to the expiration of the variance. Mr. Eastman said there have  
391 been no changes to the ordinance that would affect this request. Mr. Baum said  
392 they tend to grant the initial extension as long as the zoning has not changed.  
393 Mr. Hamel said two single family houses on this lot.

394 Mr. Baum moved to approve the request for a one year extension of the variance from March  
395 21 2017, to March 21, 2021. Ms. Davies seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

396  
397 B. Approval of Minutes: January 21 and February 18, 2020

398 Ms. Davies requested to table these minutes until the next meeting.  
399

400 C. Election of Officers

401 Mr. Baum requested to table the election of officers until more members were  
402 present.

403 Mr. Thielbar moved to retain the current officers until the next meeting. Mr. Baum seconded.  
404 The motion passed unanimously.

405

406 **IV. Adjournment**

407 Ms. Davies moved to adjourn. Mr. Baum seconded. All were in favor and the meeting was  
408 adjourned at 10:10 PM.

409

410

411 Respectfully Submitted,

412 Joanna Bartell

413 Recording Secretary